

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of March 5, 2009, claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,924,824 (“Adachi et al.”). In addition, claims 2, 10 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Adachi et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. US 2002/0105510 A1 (“Tsuchiya”) or in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,534 (“Okumura et al.”).

In response, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Adachi et al. and that the independent claims 10 and 18 are not obvious over Adachi et al. in view of Okumura et al., as explained below. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims 1, 2, 5-10 and 13-18 be allowed.

A. Patentability of Independent Claims 1, 10 and 18

The independent claim 1 recites in part “*varying the selection of subfield from line to line in each scanning cycle such that the subfields are selected in a consecutive order from line to line as the lines are scanned consecutively, the subfields of two consecutive lines do not overlap with respect to time during each scanning cycle, no two consecutive line scans use the same subfield and no line is scanned using the same subfield twice during the set of scanning cycles,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Adachi et al. Thus, the independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Adachi et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The latest Office Action on page 9 states that the cited reference of Adachi discloses “no two consecutive line scans use the same subfield (e.g. Fig. 5 shows line

2nd scans use SF1, but SF4 is scanned in line 3rd.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

On the scan line 1 (“line 2nd”) in Fig. 5(d) of Adachi et al., there are sub-frames SF1, SF2, SF3 and SF4. On the scan line 2 (“line 3rd”) in Fig. 5(d) of Adachi et al., there is only the sub-frame SF4. However, as shown in Fig. 5(b), the scan line 2 further includes the sub-frames SF1, SF2 and SF3. Fig. 5(d) is a continuation of Fig. 5(b), as explained in column 9, lines 24-30, with respect to Figs. 3(b) and 3(d). Thus, the scan lines shown in Fig. 5(b) are the same scan lines shown in Fig. 5(d). Consequently, the scan line 1 includes the sub-frames SF1, SF2, SF3 and SF4 and the scan line 2 also includes the sub-frames SF1, SF2, SF3 and SF4. Clearly, the scan lines 1 and 2 use the same sub-frames, i.e., the sub-frames SF1, SF2, SF3 and SF4. In fact, any two consecutive scan lines in Figs. 5(b) and 5(d) use at least one common sub-frame. As an example, Fig. 5(d) clearly shows that both the scan lines 13 and 14 use the same sub-frame SF2. Consequently, the cited reference of Adachi et al. fails to disclose the limitation of “*varying the selection of subfield from line to line in each scanning cycle such that... no two consecutive line scans use the same subfield,*” as recited in the independent claim 1.

In addition, the Office Action on page 9 states that the cited reference of Adachi discloses that “the subfields (i.e. SF1 and SF4, Fig. 5d) of two consecutive lines (e.g. 1 and 2) do not overlap with respect to the time during each scanning cycle (column 9, lines 48-53).” Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion as well.

As shown in Fig. 5(d), the sub-frame SF1 of the scan line 1 clearly overlaps with the sub-frame SF4 of the scan line 2. The sub-frame SF1 of the scan line 1 occupies the time blocks 36 and 37. The sub-frame SF4 of the scan line 2 also occupies the time blocks 36 and 37. Thus, the sub-frame SF1 of the scan line 1 overlaps with the sub-frame SF4 of the scan line 2 during the time blocks 36 and 37. In fact, any two consecutive scan lines in Figs. 5(b) and 5(d) have sub-frames that overlap with respect to time. As an example, Fig. 5(d) clearly shows that the sub-frame SF4 of the scan line 0 overlaps the sub-frame SF1 of the scan line 1 with respect to time. Consequently, the cited reference of Adachi et al. fails to disclose the limitation of “*varying the selection of subfield from line to line in each scanning cycle*”

such that...the subfields of two consecutive lines do not overlap with respect to time during each scanning cycle,” as recited in the independent claim 1.

Since the cited reference of Adachi et al. does not disclose the claimed limitations with respect to “*no two consecutive line scans use the same subfield*” and “*the subfields of two consecutive lines do not overlap with respect to time during each scanning cycle,*” the independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Adachi et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the independent claims 10 and 18, which recite limitations similar to the limitations of the independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 10 and 18 are not obvious over Adachi et al. in view of Okumura et al., and requests that these independent claims be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2, 5-9 and 13-17

Each of the dependent claims 2, 5-9 and 13-17 depends on one of the independent claims 1 and 10. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Petrus Maria De Greef

Date: May 5, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300